

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
ELKINS

NORBERTO DE RIVAS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-35
(BAILEY)

WARDEN ENTZEL,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James P. Mazzone [Doc. 29]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Mazzone for submission of a proposed report and recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Mazzone filed his R&R on September 17, 2018, wherein he recommends petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be dismissed without prejudice, respondent's construed Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 19] be granted, petitioner's Motion for Return of Personal Property [Doc. 25] be denied without prejudice to his right to file a *Bivens* action, and petitioner's Motion to Expedite [Doc. 26] be denied as moot.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or

recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Mazzone's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of service, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on September 20, 2018 [Doc. 30]. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the Report and Recommendation [Doc. 29] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, this Court **ORDERS** that the petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, respondent's construed Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 19] be **GRANTED**, petitioner's Motion for Return of Personal Property [Doc. 25] be **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to his right to file a *Bivens* action, and petitioner's Motion to Expedite [Doc. 26] be **DENIED AS MOOT**. This Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of respondent.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record herein and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: October 11, 2018.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Preston Bailey", written over a horizontal line.

JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE